

## REMARKS

Claims 8, 9, 11-14, and 21 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-7, 10, and 15-20 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 22-26 are added.

Claims 8, 9, 11-14 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Assignee has amended the claims and respectfully submits that the foregoing rejection is now overcome.

Claims 8, 9, and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sotheran. Assignee has amended claim 8 to recite, among other limitations, “wherein the rasterizing circuit rasterizes the second frame, if the controller provides the information regarding the second frame to the rasterizing circuit after the vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame and before a first horizontal synchronization pulse following a vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame.”

The Office Action appears to allege that either Sotheran teaches the foregoing limitation, or that the foregoing limitation would be obvious in view of Sotheran and AAPA. Sotheran at col. 295, line 45 – column 296, line 40, clearly does not teach or fairly suggest “wherein the rasterizing circuit *rasterizes the second frame*, if the controller provides the information regarding the second frame to the rasterizing circuit *after the vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame* and before a first horizontal synchronization pulse following a vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame”. Note that “rasterizes the **second frame**, if the controller provides synchronization pulse following a vertical synchronization pulse”, is in contrast with “requests a new display buffer, once very vsync .... If there is no READY Buffer, the previously displayed buffer will be repeated”. Sotheran does not state that the foregoing occurs *after* the vertical synchronization pulse.

Additionally, the Office Action at 12 relies on “if the (READY OR NOT-READY) buffer status check occurs during the vertical synchronization pulse”, to establish “before a first horizontal synchronization pulse following a vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame”. Assignee respectfully submits that “after the vertical synchronization pulse” does not read on “during the vertical synchronization pulse”.

Finally, the Office Action argues at 10 that “Should it be shown that Sotheran teaches the claimed ‘after the vertical synchronizaton pulse and before the first horizontal synchronization pulse’ subject matter with insufficient specificity, ... ‘the AAPA discloses ‘during the VBI [Vertical Blanking Interval], preparations are made for displaying the next frame’”.

However, the AAPA does not indicate that the foregoing preparation includes “provides the information regarding the second frame to the rasterizing circuit”. Thus, even if “substitution of one known vertical blanking frame preparation interval for another vertical synchronization pulse frame preparation interval” occurred, the foregoing would not teach “wherein the rasterizing circuit rasterizes the second frame, if the controller provides the information regarding the second frame to the rasterizing circuit after the vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame and before a first horizontal synchronization pulse following a vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame.”

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that the rejection to claim 8 as now amended be withdrawn, as well as to its dependent claims. Additionally, Claims 22-26 are added. Claim 22 recites, among other limitations, “rasterizing the second frame, if the controller provides the information regarding the second frame to the rasterizing circuit after the vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame and before the first horizontal synchronization pulse following the vertical synchronization pulse associated with the second frame”. Accordingly, allowance is requested for claims 22-26 as well.

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance and Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: June 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mirut Dalal  
Reg. No. 44,052  
Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100